

**REMARKS**

**Summary of the Office Action**

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's disclosed Related Art in view of Sagawa et al. (US 6,452,526).

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's disclosed Related Art in view of Sagawa et al. and Kwon (US 6,577,293).

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's disclosed Related Art in view of Sagawa et al. and Mitani et al. (US 5,714,953).

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's disclosed Related Art in view of Sagawa et al. and Kwon.

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's disclosed Related Art in view of Sagawa et al. and Mitani et al.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the indication that claims 4 and 7 contain allowable subject matter.

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 5 to more clearly define the invention. Accordingly, claims 1-7 are pending for consideration.

Applicant acknowledges the Examiner's approval of the Replacement Drawings included with the Request for Reconsideration Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 filed on August 31, 2004, as denoted in the Advisory Action dated November 1, 2004.

**All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter**

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's disclosed Related Art in view of Sagawa et al. (US 6,452,526), claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's disclosed Related Art in view of Sagawa et al. and Kwon (US 6,577,293), claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's disclosed Related Art in view of Sagawa et al. and Mitani et al. (US 5,714,953), claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's disclosed Related Art in view of Sagawa et al. and Kwon, and claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's disclosed Related Art in view of Sagawa et al. and Mitani et al. Applicant traverses these rejections as being based upon combinations of references that neither teach nor suggest the novel combination of features now clearly recited in independent claims 1 and 5, and hence dependent claims 2-7.

With respect to independent claims 1 and 5, as amended, the applied art, whether taken singly or combined, does not teach or suggest a combination including at least a timing controller outputting a selection signal and a plurality of digital to analog converters, "wherein the selection signal is to select an appropriate converter of the plurality of digital to analog converters to be driven." In contrast to Applicant's claimed invention, Applicant's Related Art data driving circuit does not include a timing controller that outputs a selection signal to select a converter of the plurality of digital to analog converters to be driven. Applicant further asserts that the Office Action does not rely on Sagawa et al., Kwon, and/or Mitani et al. to remedy the deficiencies of Applicant's disclosed Related Art. Moreover, Applicant respectfully asserts that Sagawa et al., Kwon, and/or Mitani et al. cannot remedy the deficiencies of Suzuki et al.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-7 are neither taught nor suggested by Applicant's disclosed Related Art and any of the applied prior art references, whether taken alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 should be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**


In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

By: \_\_\_\_\_



David B. Hardy  
Reg. No. 47,362

Dated: January 5, 2005

**CUSTOMER NO. 09629**  
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004